

David J. Bradley, Clerk

Respondent .

101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098

State inmate Eric Antoine Reed ("Reed") (TDCJ #348853) has filed a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State Custody ("Petition") under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 to challenge an adverse decision by the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles (the "Parole Board") (Docket Entry No. 1). The respondent, William Stephens, has filed Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment With Brief in Support ("Respondent's MSJ") (Docket Entry No. 17). Reed has replied with an Objection to the Respondent's MSJ (Docket Entry No. 23). Reed has also filed a 1st Notice Request seeking relief (Docket Entry No. 16), a Motion Request for an Evidentiary Hearing

¹The Petition identifies the petitioner as "Reed Eric Antoine" (Docket Entry No. 1, p. 1). In subsequent pleadings from both the petitioner and the respondent, it is evident that the petitioner's true name is Eric Antoine Reed. For purposes of clarifying the record, the court corrects the petitioner's name accordingly.

(Docket Entry No. 22), and a 2nd Motion Requesting for an Hearing (Docket Entry No. 24). After considering all of the pleadings and the applicable law, the court will grant Respondent's MSJ, deny the Motions filed by Reed, and dismiss the Petition for the reasons explained below.

I. Procedural History

Reed is presently incarcerated in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Correctional Institutions Division ("TDCJ") as the result of a conviction in the 209th District Court of Harris County, Texas, in cause number 352552.² On November 22, 1982, Reed entered a guilty plea to the charge of capital murder, which was reduced (on a motion by the state) to murder.³ The trial court found Reed guilty as charged and sentenced him to life imprisonment.⁴

On April 27, 2015, Reed filed the pending Petition for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.⁵ Reed does not challenge his underlying conviction. He challenges an adverse decision by the Parole Board,

²Judgment, State Habeas Record, Writ No. 15,976-01, Docket Entry No. 18-1, p. 84.

³Id. at 79, 84.

⁴Id. at 84.

⁵Petition, Docket Entry No. 1. The undated Petition was received for filing on May 1, 2015. The accompanying Memorandum of Law in Support is dated April 27, 2015 (Docket Entry No. 2, p. 2). Using the date most favorable to the petitioner, the court uses the date found on the Memorandum of Law in Support as the filing date.

denying him release on parole on June 12, 2013.⁶ Reed contends that he was denied parole in violation of Parole Board policy guidelines and the Fourteenth Amendment Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses.⁷ Respondent argues in his MSJ that the Petition must be dismissed because it is barred by the governing one-year statute of limitations on federal habeas corpus review.⁸

II. Discussion

A. The One-Year Statute of Limitations

This federal habeas corpus proceeding is governed by the Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (the "AEDPA"), Pub. L. No. 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214 (1996). Under the AEDPA all federal habeas corpus petitions filed after April 24, 1996, are subject to a one-year limitations period found in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). To the extent that Reed challenges an adverse decision by the Parole Board, the one-year statute of limitations began to run on "the date on which the factual predicate of the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(D).

⁶Notice of Parole Panel Decision, State Habeas Record, Writ No. 51,976-03, Docket Entry No. 18-4, p. 29.

⁷Petition, Docket Entry No. 1, pp. 6-7.

⁸Respondent argues in the alternative that the Petition lacks merit. See Respondent's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 17, pp. 7-13. To the extent that Reed's claims were rejected on state habeas corpus review, he does not show that the state court's decision was unreasonable or that he is entitled to relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). Because the Petition is plainly barred by the statute of limitations, the court will not address the merits further.

Reed knew or could have discovered with the exercise of due diligence the facts underlying his claims upon receiving notice of the adverse parole decision on June 12, 2013. That date triggered the statute of limitations, which expired one year later on June 12, 2014. Reed's pending Petition, executed no sooner than April 27, 2015, is well outside the limitations period and must be dismissed unless there is some basis to toll the statute of limitations.

B. Statutory Tolling

A "properly filed" state habeas corpus application tolls the AEDPA limitations period while that application is pending in state court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2). Reed filed a state application for a writ of habeas corpus on November 26, 2014,⁹ which the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals denied on April 15, 2015.¹⁰ This application does not toll the AEDPA statute of limitations because it was filed after the limitations period expired on June 12, 2014. See Scott v. Johnson, 227 F.3d 260, 263 (5th Cir. 2000) (holding that the petitioner's "state habeas application did not toll the limitation period under § 2244(d)(2) because it was not filed until after the period of limitation had expired").

⁹Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus . . . Under Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 11.07, State Habeas Record, Writ No. 51,976-03, Docket Entry No. 18-4, pp. 5-22.

¹⁰Action Taken, State Habeas Record, Writ No. 51,976-03, Docket Entry No. 18-3, p. 1.

Reed has not alleged that he was subject to state action that impeded him from filing his Petition in a timely manner. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(B). Furthermore, there is no showing of a newly recognized constitutional right upon which the Petition is based. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(C). Accordingly, there is no statutory basis to save Reed's late-filed claims.

C. Equitable Tolling

The AEDPA statute of limitations may be equitably tolled, at the district court's discretion, only "in rare and exceptional circumstances." Davis v. Johnson, 158 F.3d 806, 811 (5th Cir. 1998). The petitioner bears the burden of establishing that equitable tolling is warranted. See Howland v. Quarterman, 507 F.3d 840, 845 (5th Cir. 2007) (citing Alexander v. Cockrell, 294 F.3d 626, 629 (5th Cir. 2002)). The Supreme Court has clarified that a "[habeas] petitioner' is 'entitled to equitable tolling' only if he shows '(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way' and prevented timely filing." Holland v. Florida, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2562 (2010) (quoting Pace v. DiGuglielmo, 125 S. Ct. 1807, 1814 (2005)).

Reed has not articulated grounds for equitable tolling, and the court's own review of the record does not disclose any. After Reed was denied parole on June 12, 2013, he waited well over a year to initiate state habeas corpus review on November 26, 2014. He

offers no explanation for his delay. Equitable tolling is not available where, as here, the petitioner squanders his federal limitations period. See, e.g., Ott v. Johnson, 192 F.3d 510, 514 (5th Cir. 1999).

Although Reed proceeds pro se on federal habeas review, his incarceration and ignorance of the law do not otherwise excuse his failure to file a timely petition and are not grounds for equitable tolling. See Fisher v. Johnson, 174 F.3d 710, 714 (5th Cir. 1999); see also Cousin v. Lensing, 310 F.3d 843, 849 (5th Cir. 2002) (noting that a petitioner's ignorance or mistake is insufficient to warrant equitable tolling); Barrow v. New Orleans Steamship Ass'n, 932 F.2d 473, 478 (5th Cir. 1991) (finding that "lack of knowledge of [the] filing deadlines," "lack of representation," "unfamiliarity with the legal process," "illiteracy," and "ignorance of legal rights" generally do not justify equitable tolling).

Based on this record the court concludes that Reed's circumstances are not among those "rare and exceptional" conditions that warrant deviation from the express rules that Congress has provided. See Felder v. Johnson, 204 F.3d 168, 173 (5th Cir. 2000). Absent a valid basis for tolling the statute of limitations, the Petition will be dismissed as untimely under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1).

III. Certificate of Appealability

Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases requires a district court to issue or deny a certificate of appealability when

entering a final order that is adverse to the petitioner. A certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner makes "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right," 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), which requires a petitioner to demonstrate "that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Tennard v. Dretke, 124 S. Ct. 2562, 2565 (2004) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1604 (2000)). Under the controlling standard this requires a petitioner to show "that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.'" Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003). Where denial of relief is based on procedural grounds the petitioner must show not only that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right," but also that they "would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." Slack, 120 S. Ct. at 1604.

A district court may deny a certificate of appealability, sua sponte, without requiring further briefing or argument. See Alexander v. Johnson, 211 F.3d 895, 898 (5th Cir. 2000). For reasons set forth above, this court concludes that jurists of reason would not debate whether any procedural ruling in this case

was correct or whether the petitioner states a valid claim for relief. Therefore, a certificate of appealability will not issue.


IV. Conclusion and Order

Based on the foregoing, the court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Respondent William Stephens' Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket Entry No. 17) is **GRANTED**.
2. Petitioner Eric Antoine Reed's 1st Notice Request seeking relief (Docket Entry No. 16), Motion Request for an Evidentiary Hearing (Docket Entry No. 22), and 2nd Motion Requesting for an Hearing (Docket Entry No. 24) are **DENIED**.
3. The Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State Custody (Docket Entry No. 1) is **DISMISSED with prejudice** as barred by the statute of limitations.
4. A certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

The Clerk shall provide a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to the parties.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this 29th day of December, 2015.



SIM LAKE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE